



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/528,201	09/27/2005	Per Halvarsson	43315-214729	4418
26694	7590	07/12/2006	EXAMINER	
VENABLE LLP P.O. BOX 34385 WASHINGTON, DC 20045-9998			BAISA, JOSELITO SASIS	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2832	

DATE MAILED: 07/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/528,201	Applicant(s) HALVARSSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Joselito Baisa	Art Unit 2832	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 March 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/27/2005</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 9, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kauferle et al. [3942100] in view of Breitenbach et al. [4785138].

Kauferle et al. disclose an installation for transmission of electric power via high voltage ac voltage line wherein, the installation comprises one or more inductors **b** located along the extent of the cable **f** between the switchgear units and integrated into the cable **f**, inductors **b** being connected between the conductor of the cable **f** and ground for reactive shunt compensation [Col. 2, Lines 23-35, Figure 1].

Kauferle et al. disclose the instant claimed invention above except for the cable being an extruded cable with an inner electric conductor, an insulating layer of a solid material surrounding said conductor, and an outer screen layer located at ground potential.

Breitenbach et al. disclose an extruded cable **3** with an inner electric conductor **5**, an insulating layer **8** of a solid material surrounding conductor **5**, and an outer screen layer **10** located at ground potential [Col. 4, Lines 6-53, Figure 2].

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the extruded cable as taught by Breitenbach et al. to the electric power transmission system of Kauferle et al..

The motivation would have been due to the capability of the reactive power compensator to improve the stability of the transmission system [Col. 1, Lines 47-53].

Regarding claims 2 and 3, Kauferle et al. disclose a plurality of inductors distributed uniformly along the line at considerable distances [Col. 2, Lines 23-40].

Regarding claim 5, Breitenbach et al. disclose the cable 3 is of the type that comprises an inner layer 7, arranged nearest the conductor 5, with an electrical conductivity that is lower than the electrical conductivity of the conductor but sufficient to cause this inner layer to act in a potential-equalizing manner to equalize the electric field externally of this inner layer, and wherein the screen layer 10 has an electrical conductivity that is higher than that of the insulating layer 8 to render the screen layer capable of functioning in a potential-equalizing manner, through connection to ground, and to essentially enclose the electric field that arises inside the screen layer as a result of the electric conductor [Col. 3, Lines 50-60; Col. 4, Lines 43-60, Figure 2].

Regarding claim 8, Kauferle et al. discloses the inductor comprises a winding arranged in a casing 50 located at ground potential, the winding being connected by one end to the electric conductor of the cable and by its other end to the casing 50 [Col. 2, Lines 23-33, Figure 1].

Regarding claim 9, Kauferle et al. discloses the inductor is provided with an auxiliary winding for delivering auxiliary energy to a consumer, such as equipment for operation of parts of the installation and communication between such parts and / or between the installation and external equipment [Col. 2, Lines 58-68, Figure 1].

Regarding claims 11 and 12, Kauferle et al. discloses the ac voltage line exhibits three phases with a cable for each phase [Col. 3, Lines 38-46].

Regarding claim 18, Kauferle et al. discloses the dimensioning of the inductor and the distance between adjacent inductors and between the inductor and a switchgear unit, respectively, are adapted to

Art Unit: 2832

the magnitude of the voltage the cable is intended to carry and the shunt capacitance /unit of length of the cable to essentially eliminate capacitive currents in the cable.

2. Claims 4 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kauferle et al. in view of Breitenbach et al. as applied in claim 1 above, and further in view of Kawasaki [5716574].

Kauferle et al. in view of Breitenbach et al. disclose the instant claimed invention above except for the an insulating layer of cross-linked polyethylene.

Kawasaki discloses an insulating layer of cross-linked polyethylene [Col. 6, Lines 50-55].

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the insulating layer of cross-linked polyethylene as taught by Kawasaki to the cable of Breitenbach et al.

The motivation would have been to produce a high quality cable [Col. 5, Lines 20-27].

Regarding claim 13, Kauferle et al. in view of Breitenbach et al. disclose the instant claimed invention above except for the cable is designed to have a system voltage of between 50 kv and 500 kv, preferably between 30 kv and 300kv, between the conductor and the screen layer.

Kawasaki discloses a cable designed to have a system voltage of between 50 kv and 500 kv, preferably between 30 kv and 300kv, between the conductor and the screen layer [Col. 8, Lines 42-47].

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention use the cable as taught by Kawasaki that has a system voltage between 30 kv to 300 kv to the structure of Kauferle et al. in view of Breitenbach et al.

The motivation would have been to ensure excellent electrical and mechanical properties of the cable at 30-300 kv system voltage.

3. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kauferle et al. in view of Breitenbach et al. as applied in claim 1 above, and further in view of [JP 06261456].

Kauferle et al. in view of Breitenbach et al. disclose the instant claimed invention above except for the inductor is completely or partially buried in the ground.

[JP 06261456] discloses the inductor is completely or partially buried in the ground [Abstract].

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the inductor completely or partially buried in the ground as taught by [JP 06261456] to the structure of Kauferle et al. in view of Breitenbach et al.

The motivation would have been for safety concern.

Regarding claim 7, Kauferle et al. in view of Breitenbach et al. disclose the instant claimed invention above except for the cable, at the inductor, is divided into a cable part on both sides of the point of connection to the cable, wherein the installation comprises means for connection of the inductor to the cable comprising three connection devices for connection of an end of the electric conductor of each cable part to a respective such device and an end of the inductor to the third device, and a member for electrically interconnecting the three devices.

[JP 06261456] discloses the cable, at the inductor, is divided into a cable part on both sides of the point of connection 7 to the cable, wherein the installation comprises means for connection of the inductor to the cable comprising three connection devices for connection of an end of the electric conductor of each cable part to a respective such device and an end of the inductor to the third device 2, and a member for electrically interconnecting the three devices [see Figure and Abstract].

Art Unit: 2832

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use means for connection of the inductor to the cable comprising three connection devices as taught by [JP 06261456] to the structure of Kauferle et al. in view of Breitenbach et al..

The motivation would have been to increase stability of the system [Abstract].

4. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kauferle et al. in view of Breitenbach et al. as applied in claim 1 above, and further in view of Johansen [EP 0825465].

Kauferle et al. in view of Breitenbach et al. disclose the instant claimed invention above except for an optical fiber laid along the cable or integrated into the cable, for use of a device for protection of the installation and/or commercial communication within the installation and/or with the surrounding.

Johansen discloses an optical fiber, laid along the cable or integrated into the cable, for use of a device for protection of the installation and/or commercial communication within the installation and/or with the surrounding [Abstract].

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention have an optical fiber, laid along the cable or integrated into the cable, for use of a device for protection of the installation and/or commercial communication as taught by Johansen to the installation of Kauferle et al. in view of Breitenbach et al.

The motivation would have been to be able to establish communication to a remote device in the installation [Abstract].

5. Claims 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kauferle et al. in view of Breitenbach et al. as applied in claim 1 above, and further in view of Ainsworth [6441712].

Art Unit: 2832

Kauferle et al. in view of Breitenbach et al. disclose the instant claimed invention above except for the installation is designed for a maximum transmissible power, via the ac voltage line of 50 MW-600 MW and the inductor for a reactive power of 5-30 MVAR.

Ainsworth discloses the installation is designed for a maximum transmissible power, via the ac voltage line of 50 MW-600 MW and the inductor for a reactive power of 5-30 MVAR [Col. 3, Lines 52-54; Col. 4, Lines 46-52].

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the installation and the inductor as taught by Ainsworth to the structure of Kauferle et al. in view of Breitenbach et al.

The motivation would have been ensure excellent electrical performance of the system.

With respect to claims 15 and 16, Kauferle et al. disclose the claimed invention except for the claimed distance between the switchgears. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to alter the distance between the switchgears since applicant has not disclosed that a distance of 25 km or larger solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the switchgears being separated as shown by Kauferle et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joselito Baisa whose telephone number is (571) 272-7132. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 5:30 am to 2:00 pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Elvin Enad can be reached on (571) 272-1990. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2832

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Joselito Baisa
Examiner
Art Unit 2832

jsb


ELVIN ENAD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
10 July 06